

*American Indians*

A F A R T H E R  
A P P E A L  
T O T H E  
Unprejudiced Judgment of Mankind,  
I N B E H A L F O F T H E  
I N D I A N S.  
I N T W O P A R T S.

C O N T A I N I N G,

- I. ANIMADVERSIONS upon some late Arguments of a Right Reverend Prelate of the Church of England, in reference to our sending Missionaries from hence to convert the Indians. Written in the Year 1760.
- II. THOUGHTS upon the proper Means and Measures of converting the Indians to true Christianity. Written in the Year 1764.

---

*Magni aliquando errores magnorum virorum transmittuntur posteris.—Sed opus est librâ et examine.* PLIN.

---

To which are added,

CONSIDERATIONS relative to the Subject of the foregoing Proposals, particularly that of appointing Bishops or Superintendents in our Colonies abroad.

BY ANOTHER HAND:

Both Joint-Writers in the *Free and Candid Disquisitions relating to the Church of England, &c.*

With a POSTSCRIPT and an APPENDIX.

---

L O N D O N,

Printed for A. MILLAR, in the Strand.

MDCCLXVI.

# APPAL

TOTHE

Originals of Manuscripts

IN BENEFIT OF THE

## INDIANS

### IN TWO PARTS.

CONTAINING

I. An Introduction upon some late Arguments  
of a Right Reverend Father of the Church of  
England, in reference to our landing Millions-  
ties from hence to convert the Indians. Written  
in the Year 1760.

II. Thoughts upon the proper Means and Me-  
thods of converting the Indians to true Chris-  
tians. Written 1764.



Printed by J. DODD, at the Theatre Royal, in Pall Mall.

To which are added,

CONSIDERATIONS relative to the Subjects  
of the foregoing Proposals, particularly that of ap-  
plying Bishops or Superintendants in our Colonies abroad.

BY ANOTHER HAND.

Both Joint-Writers in the First and Second Editions  
of the foregoing Proposals, and in the present Edition.

With a Postscript and an Appendix.

LONDON.

Printed by A. MILLAR, in the Strand.

MDCCLXXIV.



---

A FARTHER  
A P P E A L, &c.

---

P A R T I.

**I**T was not till very lately that the sermon upon which I am going to bestow some animadversions, was accidentally put into my hands; else I might perhaps have offered my thoughts upon it sooner: And indeed, I somewhat wonder that it has thus long escaped examination from other hands.

I approve, as much as any man, of the great and good design of propagating the religion of Christ amongst the *Americans*, but cannot approve of every method, or of every argument, that is sometimes used to promote it.

The worthy Society for propagating the Gospel in foreign parts, will be so good as to consider about the former; and I will take the liberty to consider a single article in reference to the latter.

My attention in these strictures, shall be directed chiefly to what my Lord of St. David's has been pleased to offer, against sending Divines of note

A

for

*D: Anthony Ellys*

for their characters and abilities, to propagate the Christian religion in our plantations abroad (a).

One would naturally have thought, that eminence of character and abilities in a clergyman going over to preach the Gospel in our foreign colonies, would give the greater weight and efficacy to his instructions, and make him not only more acceptable to, but also to be more highly revered by, the poor uninstructed people, to whom he cheerfully goes upon so good an errand. I am sure we think so with regard to our Divines here in England; and always find in fact, that none do more good than those who are shining lights in both these respects. And why we should not think, that the poor helpless *Americans* would be equally delighted and benefited by such men, if they could be so happy as to have them, I own I am hitherto at a loss to know, nor do I think that any body can oblige me with a sufficient reason.

Why should we offer any arguments against measures honestly proposed for doing the greater good? Why should we think that the disregarded Indians can be more content than we ourselves are, or can be, with having *the lowest and meanest of the people made priests of the high places*, and set over us by authority, to be our instructors in things of the utmost consequence, when we at the same time know and see daily, that they are extremely unqualified for such an office, and less able to do us good than they are to do us harm? Why should we not on this occasion, and in this view, place ourselves in the condition of those Indians, and feelingly suppose *their* case to be *ours*? Why should we not be desirous and even eager, to do

(a) In a sermon preached before the incorporated Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in foreign parts, on Friday, February 23, 1759.

those distressed heathens all the good that can possibly lie in our power? And particularly, why at any time throw *cold water* upon any well-meant and well-calculated scheme of charity, that can be proposed for the instruction and salvation of those of our fellow-creatures, *for whom Christ died*?

The best men both for ability and character, are unquestionably the fittest to engage in that arduous, but noble undertaking.

But suppose no such men here should be found willing and free to go; are we therefore to despair? Are we therefore to seek out reasons to confirm and countenance them in their refusal, and to withhold or deter others, who, in time to come, may be more willing? Or if we should, after all, fail, and no men of distinguished worth should offer themselves for this salutary and truly Christian undertaking, are we therefore to leave the great work unattempted? And is there no way to have it executed but by *our own men*?

Now for the removal of the objections that have been offered, and to make us all sit easy (as we desire) at home, *every man under his own vine, and his own fig-tree*; suppose there might peradventure be found among the natives, or other inhabitants of those less enlightened parts, men of truly valuable characters, both for good life, sound sense, an adequate (or at least a sufficient) knowledge of the Gospel, and a spirit truly evangelical: might not these men answer the good purpose? answer it full as well, if not better than many, if not most, of those that we can find willing here to quit their native country, traverse the wide seas, settle among Barbarians, engage in unknown difficulties, expose themselves to unknown dangers, and a thousand other inconveniences, — and all this for the sake of the *Gospel* only?



I resume therefore my query, and press it. Supposing, as I said, that a competent supply of good and faithful ministers might, by discreet management, be provided upon the spot (and surely you will not say, that *Great Britain* alone is the fertile soil wherein such hopeful plants do grow) will not our objections and excuses then be at an end? Or if, ever indulgent to ourselves, and our own dear secular interests and aspiring views, we should invent any farther and quite new apologies, would they not immediately appear vain, expose our insincerity, shew that we are not in earnest, and convince the world that we have quite other views than what we pretend?

Surely human nature, unperturbed from its first and best principles, is generally the same in *America*, as it is in *Europe*; and perhaps in some instances, nay probably in many, even superior to what any part of *Europe* can boast of. And to put the matter home, let me freely ask, and let our certain knowledge answer, Have we not lately, for several years successively, heard of men of excellent natural abilities, and of no less excellent morals, produced in those too much neglected, if not despised, recesses of the globe? though, by the way, we do not seem to despise or neglect the accumulations of wealth and power, which it is our good fortune to receive every year from thence; not regarding in the mean time, the wretched slavery, spiritual and temporal, of the unhappy natives, from whose labours and country those beatifying acquisitions flow.

But to go on with my argument. Supposing that there are, or may be, and most certainly there are, and will be, such men in our colonies abroad, who yet have never been in *Great Britain*; might not such men be selected, and properly instructed  
and



and encouraged, to preach the Gospel to their countrymen, without going a step out of their native continent? And if we do not honour them with high titles and stations, as we do many of our Divines here, might not nevertheless, the great work of the Christian ministry, and the true design of the Gospel, be carried on as effectually and prosper as much in their hands, as if they were advanced to those degrees of eminency in rank and appearance, which we seem not willing to allow them, and which we are not willing neither, that any of our own clergy of such distinction should go over to deserve and assume there.

Let this question be calmly considered, and fairly answered.

In the mean time my Lord of *St. David's* will give me leave to make a few remarks, upon a late argument of his Lordship on this head.

As far as I know, he states the case fairly. He mentions indeed, in his stating it, a suggestion, which I, for my part, had never heard of before, and which, in all likelihood, I never should have heard of, to this day, if it had not been for his publication of it. But I do by no means conclude from thence, that the representation given of it by this right reverend Divine, is in the least questionable. Of this I am convinced, that the suggestion, from what hands soever it comes, is a very natural one, and therefore likely enough to be offered at one time or other, especially in this country of liberty, if not also in our plantations abroad, which are more immediately interested in this affair. And were the thing after all really questionable, yet his Lordship's having taken notice of it, and condescended to bestow upon it an answer, prevents all farther inquiry about its being fact.

The suggestion however which falls under our Prelate's notice, is this.

"That much greater success [*in propagating the Gospel in foreign parts*] might probably be expected, if some of the clergy of greater note for their character and abilities, would engage in the work. As they pretend to succeed the Apostles in other respects, they should do it in this, and try how the work would prosper in their hands (b)."

Now what answer doth the Bishop (who had undertaken to be the Advocate for the good designs of the Society) make to this? You shall hear, and I will freely leave you to judge.

He is pleased to tell you, that this suggestion, "whatever be the spirit from which it proceeds," (which seems, by the way, to intimate, that it is no good spirit, at least not favourable to the true propagation of Christianity, and perhaps also that it obliquely glances at the duties of men in high stations in the Church) is thus answered.

"That the present clergy, though greatly inferior in many respects to the holy Apostles, are yet partakers of that sacred ministry which our Saviour designed should in all ages be continued, for the instruction and edification of his church." Referring us, at the foot of the page, to a declaration of St. Paul, Ephes. iv. 11. (c).

To stop here a little. It seems proper to exhibit the Apostle's words in full view, that we may better judge of their design. I shall only premise the 7th verse, for a necessary introduction, and then the words will run thus.

*Unto every one of us is given grace, according to the measure of the gift of Christ.—And he gave some Apostles, and some Prophets, and some Evangelists, and some Pastors and Teachers; for the perfecting the saints,*

(b) Sermon, p. 21. (c) Ibid.

for

*for the work of the ministry, for the edifying the body of Christ; till we all come, in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ.*

I presume this is the whole passage, as far as his Lordship judged it to be pertinent to his purpose, or was desirous that we should consider it as any way relating to his argument. If his Lordship meant to extend the passage farther, I shall have no objection, and will readily join in the issue of the argument, which hitherto does not seem to be very auspicious to his Lordship's cause, nor to promise it any great assistance.

Let us briefly see what can be fairly made out in favour of his Lordship's argument, from the passage as above set forth. I doubt very little, rather much to the contrary.

Texts of scripture, whether produced or only referred to, in a sermon, are generally intended, as far as I have been able to discern, either to illustrate or confirm a proposition, or else to press some natural or Christian duty upon the minds and lives of men.

His Lordship, in referring us to this passage, can, I think, only mean to strengthen his answer to the supposed objection.

Consider it in this light, and what will it avail you?

The objection (or call it, if you please, a suggestion only) was this.

That the sending men of eminence, or at least of greater note for their characters, and abilities, to propagate the Gospel in foreign parts, would probably be attended with greater success, than (I presume I may have leave to add) the sending over

inferior persons, for the carrying on this great design.

Does the apostolical passage under view, say any thing about this? — unless you can suppose that the suggestion meant, that we should send over *inspired Apostles, Prophets, and Evangelists*, with immediate commission from heaven, (and then, by the way, where would be the need of a commission from any earthly potentates) with power to work miracles, &c.; which, I may well take it for granted, was never intended in the suggestion proposed, nor can be intruded upon us by any but enthusiasts. --- Yet it is, I think, universally allowed, that the Apostle alludes wholly in this passage to the primitive and well known *χαρισματα* of those times, and give me leave to subjoin, of those times only (*d*). Expect in vain such high donations now.

(*d*) Verse 8th, 11th, &c. *He gave gifts unto men* — *some apostles, some prophets, some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers, &c.*] “ That these pastors and teachers (says Dr. *Whitby*) in the “ first ages, were men of extraordinary gifts, is evident from “ this very place, where the words, *He gave gifts unto men*, ver. “ 8. shew, that all the persons mentioned in ver. 11. were partakers of the gifts which Christ, ascending up on high, and sending down the holy Spirit, gave to men. Hence among “ the different *χαρισματα*, or gifts of the holy Ghost, are reckoned “ *Prophecy, Doctrine, Teaching*, and other *diversities of gifts*, Rom. “ xii. 6, 7. 1 Cor. xiv. 6, 26. and xii. 28. When these extraordinary gifts ceased, the very names of those doctors, and others “ who were endowed with them, grew out of use. — A succession “ of such persons was neither promised, nor was necessary afterwards to attain the end for which those supernatural gifts were “ then conferred.” *In loc.*

So that the reference to this passage, as applied, or as supposed, in any proper sense, to relate to *the present clergy*, is out of place and time, and a manifest distortion of the words to a meaning which they will not bear, nor were intended to import. It cannot be said that the reference had no such view. Then why was it made? And why doth it point directly to the *present clergy*, who are, in this very place, expressly asserted by his Lordship, to be *partakers of that sacred ministry, which our Saviour designed*

But



But say, We mean only *Pastors* and *Teachers* (the last offices there mentioned) in the ordinary way. And indeed, if you could mean any thing farther, you would find yourselves wofully at a loss to clear up and confirm your meaning. However, to give you fair and full scope, say only this, and where would your argument end?--- We ought, say you, to send over *Pastors* and *Teachers* (and every serious Christian will heartily wish, that you may always send over faithful ones, and will, at the same time, as heartily pray that they may have the utmost success); but it does not (you will go on to say) appear to be necessary, that we should delegate thither, as missionaries, men of “*greater note for their characters and abilities*” here at home.

Is this any thing to the purpose of the Apostle's declaration? or does it at all invalidate the force of the objection? Does it not rather confirm it?--- Send over *Pastors* and *Teachers*.---Who would think that by *Pastors* and *Teachers*, in the very lowest degree of the Apostle's sense, was meant only the refuse and scum of the Clergy? men who are neither *Pastors*, nor *Teachers*, in the true sense of the words, and would have been excluded, not only from the ministry, but also out of the church, in the Apostle's days.---Why not rather send over honest men, men of seriousness, men of piety and approved worth? Why not Clergy of *greater note* for their characters and abilities? &c.

*should in all ages be continued, for the instruction and edification of his church?*

If any learned person should be so hardy as to undertake to justify the application made of this passage to the clergy of modern times, I should be glad to see his *paraphrase* of the whole context; and the world will, I believe, expect such a paraphrase from him, if he shall think it prudent to engage in the defence of that application.

But

But I ask pardon. I have gone perhaps too far, and therefore stop here ; though I could proceed much farther, and could also, I believe, shew even to demonstration, that this passage of *St. Paul's*, if pursued to its utmost length, knocks in the head at once all modern pretensions, and all the arguments commonly urged against sending over missionaries of greater note for their characters and abilities, &c. into our American colonies, with a view to preach the Gospel of Christ in its purity, in those dark abodes. All which may be better forborne for the present, than urged, since it would be urged to no purpose, being sure to be heard with little patience, and perhaps to be treated with sovereign contempt, if not also with unmannerly sneer and ridicule : which we too well know to be very common, though very unreasonable and extremely unbecoming in such cases.

The sum of his Lordship's answer thus far, supported with his reference to the passage which we have seen, centers in this assertion : " That the  
 " present clergy are partakers of that sacred ministry  
 " which our Saviour designed should in all ages be  
 " continued, for the instruction and edification of  
 " his church." About which I shall have no debate with his Lordship, or with any other, let the truth of the fact be what it will. Others may consider and may possibly discern grounds for some degree of doubt in certain instances. But let this pass for the present.

To the foregoing words, my Lord immediately subjoins : --- " But it does not from thence follow  
 " that we ALL are obliged to preach the Gospel in  
 " foreign parts."

Doth the suggestion say, or even intimate, that we are ALL to go over ? and that we are *obliged* to do so ? --- The words, as given by my Lord himself,

self, (upon whose credit we take them) are these ;  
 --- " If SOME of the Clergy of greater note for  
 " their characters and abilities, would engage in  
 " this work (e)."

How comes it about that we are so instantane-  
 ously got out of our view ? How is it to be ac-  
 counted for, that we find this sudden and unex-  
 pected change of the terms in the same page ? ---  
 SOME, says the objection ; ALL, says his Lordship.  
 --- Some of the Clergy of *greater note*, says the ob-  
 jection : All the Clergy in *general* (meaning, I pre-  
 sume, those of the whole Church of England, and  
 perhaps of Ireland too) his Lordship is pleased  
 to return : --- and all, whether of *greater* or *lesser*  
*note*, or whether of any note at all in the church,  
 either for their *characters* or their *abilities*, or both,  
 or whether of note perhaps for a quite contrary turn  
 in both respects. --- And if you should not think

(e) *Quære* :—When the suggestion only intimates, " that much  
 " greater success might probably be expected, IF SOME of the  
 " clergy of greater note for their characters and abilities WOULD  
 " engage in this work ;" never once imagining nor desiring that  
 ALL our clergy would actually go over, nor thinking that they  
 OUGHT to do so, is it fair to extend that restrictive supposition  
 to an universal obligation ? or is it reason for reason to say, " It  
 " does not hence follow (and surely it does not, nor was in-  
 tended to follow) that WE ALL, namely, all the *present clergy who*  
*are engaged in the service of the church here at home*, are OBLIGED  
 to go and *preach the Gospel in foreign parts*." It would have been  
 somewhat more pertinent, and less exceptionable upon the whole,  
 if our Answerer had said, " It does not from thence follow that  
 " ANY of us are obliged to preach," &c. And yet even this  
 would not fully come up to the point ; which is plainly confined  
 to our *clergy of greater note for their character and abilities* ; and  
 still not to ALL even of *them* ; but, as the suggestion precisely  
 specifies, to SOME only : " If SOME of the clergy of greater note,  
 " &c. would engage in this work."—Would *Pearson* (a fair and  
 clear reasoner, and a Bishop also, as well as my Lord of St. Da-  
 vid's) have argued in that other manner ?

— *Quantum dixeris ab illo !*



fit to send these over, why should they be employed here at home ?

Now, how shall a plain honest man, a man of common understanding, who reverences the episcopal order of the Church of England, and cannot entertain a thought that any of her Prelates will prevaricate, especially in a sermon, and in a sermon deliberately made public, and intended to be sent, and, I believe, actually conveyed, into almost all parts of his Majesty's dominions both at home and abroad, how shall such a man be able to judge here ? --- If he judges at all, can he think, that this is fair dealing, and truly honourable ? --- to *state* a question first, and then immediately to *pervert* it ? --- to lay down the *words* of an objection, and then change the terms of it, and shift the *scene* of the argument ? --- I own I am amazed, and know not what to plead in defence of our Prelate. --- I cannot plead : No honest man can : The words are so plain, and the perversion, I must not, I will not, scruple to say, the *prevarication*, is so gross and so glaring. Why is the noble science of theology exposed to contempt, and its credit weakened by the meanness of the chicanery ? --- Even our schools, I hope, litigious as they sometimes are, remain hitherto, and I heartily wish they may always remain, unacquainted with this kind of sophistry ; which can impose upon none but the vulgar, who generally take all they read upon trust, especially from their superiors of *greater note for their characters and abilities*. And why should even the poor vulgar, our fellow-creatures, fellow-christians, and fellow-subjects, amongst whom this sermon is dispersed far and wide, be so imposed upon, especially by a right reverend Prelate of the Church of England ?

I sincerely wish, for my Lord of St. David's credit, and for the honour of true religion, that his



Lordship either had never consented to publish this sermon, or so consenting, had been pleased to review what he had delivered from the pulpit upon this particular topic, and thereupon either dropped this part of his sermon in the publication, or made his answer to the suggestion more solid, and also free, even from the remotest suspicion of his prevaricating in so great and so plain a case, and upon an occasion every way so solemn.

But let us go on.

“ For [*in the next words*] we are already, by  
 “ the providence of God, engaged in the service  
 “ of his church here at home ; where we have em-  
 “ ployment more than sufficient for all our abilities,  
 “ and all our care. Now if any one of us, engaged  
 “ thus at home, be obliged to preach the gospel a-  
 “ broad, the same obligation must lie upon all of us,  
 “ since there is nothing to determine it to any one  
 “ more than to another (*f*). ”

The argument here may to many appear plausible, but is really upon the whole (and I am indeed sorry to say it) fallacious. --- Only reflect a little, and judge according to *common sense* ; and I desire no better judge, in a case so obvious to common understanding, than common sense, joined with common honesty. “ If *one* is obliged, then *all* are  
 “ obliged ; there is no rule to determine, &c. ” ----  
 The objectors did not suggest that *any* were obliged. They only judged it *reasonable* (and so must every man of reason) that *some of greater note for their characters and abilities, should* take the lead, being commissioned by authority, to preach the gospel of Christ, among the poor heathens and converts in our settlements abroad. And is not this indeed desirable, as well as reasonable ? Why (let me ask again) why should we shun the good work, if really

(*f*) Sermon, p. 22.

desirous

desirous to promote it? --- or at least, why prevaricate, in order to avoid it? --- Does it indeed *follow* (to use his Lordship's expression) that ALL lie under equally the same obligation? --- That if ONE must quit his charge, suppose in England or Ireland, or any where else within these seas, ALL must, by parity of reason, do the same, and leave these countries destitute of Ministers? --- and, that in this case (which nevertheless is a case not in the least supposed by the objection) there can be no rule, no medium, no criterion, by which to determine, *Who shall go, or Who shall not go?* Since *all* alike, as his Lordship is pleased to represent the matter, *must go*, and there can be no difference. An hard case this, it must be owned, if it were the true case, or the true state of it: which apparently it is not, and every eye can discern the fallacy.

“ But if [what is not desired or expected, if]  
 “ ALL the present Clergy were to quit their charges  
 “ in this country, and if they who succeed them  
 “ were always, as by parity of reason they ought, to do  
 “ the same, the public worship of God, and other  
 “ parts of his service as appointed by Christ, would  
 “ here soon be at an end.” [No body doubts it, no one will be so hardy as to contradict it, no body will be so wicked as even to wish it.] “ But as that  
 “ consequence must, to all persons well disposed,  
 “ appear absurd, this consideration plainly shews,  
 “ that those of the Clergy, who are any where fixed  
 “ in particular stations for the service of God, and  
 “ have no special calls from the holy Spirit (g).” [By

(g) *No special calls from the holy Spirit.*] It appears to me that in many instances, both of public discourse, and private conversation, and in printed writings also, we make abundantly too free with this sacred Agent, insomuch that his calls, his motions, his illuminations, his illapses, his withdrawals, and the like, are become, in a manner, cant-terms. Do we not make more free the

the way, why so bold a word, and what is the real meaning of it? Would not such an expression; dropped by an inferior writer, fall under a suspicion of some degree of enthusiasm? --- But this in passing: --- *no special calls from the holy Spirit*] “to go

with this divine Spirit, than we have any just authority to do from scripture or reason; even in our solemn offices? — “*Do you trust that you are inwardly moved by the holy Ghost? — Come, holy Ghost, our souls inspire. — Come, holy Ghost, eternal God, proceeding from above. — Receive the holy Ghost by the imposition of our hands.*” After these strong and bold declarations, established and kept up by a national church, we need the less wonder, when we hear any of the Fathers of it speaking of some *special calls from the holy Spirit* to certain clergymen, to go abroad for the propagation of the Gospel, or when we find the church herself, in one of her canons, asserting the clergy (I suppose in general) to be *the special messengers and ministers of Almighty God*.

Now if this be the case, if (to argue somewhat in our Prelate's own way, assuming from premises not granted) all the Clergy who have received Priest's orders, have received also the holy Ghost; and if those who have received the holy Ghost, have thereby commenced *special messengers and ministers of Almighty God*; Do they need any other more *special calls from the same holy Spirit*, to go and preach the Gospel in foreign parts? How shall they distinguish the latter calls from the former, and be more sure of the one sort of call, than they are of the other? And where will you find those who will obey the latter call in preference to the former? And if you can find none of this stamp, (or but few comparatively, if any) the poor Indians may wait long enough, before they have preachers from these parts, who have really and truly those *special calls from the holy Spirit* to go amongst them. — You see now to what a dilemma this way of reasoning will ultimately reduce us. It is well if it doth not sometimes terminate in rank enthusiasm.

A man may easily say, when he is either pressed by want at home, or tempted by money abroad, or both, that he has a *call* (and a *special* one too) from the holy Spirit, to leave this country of Christians, and go over to preach among the Heathens. But does he not say as much to the full in another case, when at his ordination he solemnly declares to the Bishop, that he trusts he is *inwardly moved by the holy Ghost to this office and ministration*? All that go over have declared this at their entering into orders. And yet do we not well know that the views, conduct, and tempers of many of them, both before and after, have flatly belied their declaration, and proved it to be all a farce and an imposition?

“a broad



“ abroad for the propagation of the gospel, are not  
 “ obliged personally to engage in that work (*b*).”

I need not make any particular remarks here. They are made before. You see the same way of arguing (all upon suppositions not granted, all upon allegations merely fictitious, and invented only to serve a turn) runs in a current throughout this answer.

But I will pursue his Lordship's tergiversations no farther. I am really tired, and almost regret the pains I have taken to refute a way of reasoning, which is so visibly precarious, and (what is still more affecting) of pernicious consequence, in regard to the spreading of the true doctrine and morals of the gospel in foreign parts. Which is my only excuse (and I hope it will be judged by all men of reason to be a just one) for my assuming the liberty to animadvert upon the reasonings of a personage of such high distinction in the Church, to whom I would pay all the respect due to his station, that can be any way consistent with the superior respect due to truth, and with a free remonstrance in its behalf, when authority alone would bear it down, and frame any excuse, though ever so trivial, to support a favourite system, and to retard the progress that the Gospel would otherwise certainly make among the heathen nations, if it was taught them in its true purity, and by truly good and able men, such as have its interest sincerely at heart; and if, at the same time, the propagation of it was duly encouraged by those, who have the power and means of doing it.

I have now done with the passage in the sermon upon which I intended, and have taken the freedom, to animadvert; closing my remarks with this query, which I leave to be considered. — If our chief clergy are pleased to argue after this manner, and

(*b*) Sermon, p. 22.

with



with these evasions, in discouragement of propagating the Gospel abroad, by such ministers as would do it service and credit; can we wonder, if we should hear, as we sometimes do, that some of our principal Lay-gentlemen in our foreign plantations are so remiss in assisting, and so unwilling to contribute towards the maintenance of unworthy missionaries, sent over for this purpose by those chief Divines? — I will urge no more on this head, having something still to subjoin upon another.

We have heard our Bishop's reasonings and defences; with which I declare again I am not satisfied, being, to me at least, no way convincing, nor appearing to be at all worthy of a person of such eminence.

If it should not be thought too much presumption (in farther addition to the liberty I have taken, and for which I can scarce promise myself a ready and good-natured pardon) I will venture briefly to intimate, what, in the judgment of serious and sensible men, who intirely honour the Christian religion and desire its propagation, would have been the true and just answer to the proposal or suggestion offered.

I know how hard it is for some men, to make *concessions* of any sort, when they are pressed home with an argument. They will rather *sifle* evidence, *puzzle* a cause, and throw out answers at random (*b*).

But ingenuity is always best; and it is far more honourable to acknowledge, than disown truth, and to militate against it. Why can we not bring ourselves into this temper? and what reason is there that we ought not?

(*b*) See a palpable instance of this kind in the last answer of Mr. K. to Mr. Moyle, concerning the thundering legion. *Non persuadebis, etiamsi persuaseris.*

For my part, I confess freely, that I should have answered in some such manner as this, but in a friendly and serious conversation *only*.

“ Gentlemen, what you suggest is not unreasonable. It is certainly right that men of the best characters, and best abilities, should be sent over into our plantations. And the Gospel will never shine there or any where else, but when promoted as you desire, by men of real worth, approved morals, knowledge of the scriptures in their true sense, judicious zeal, great prudence, great moderation, — if not also, in some cases, men of eminent rank, and justly reverend for their stations, as well as goodness.

“ But, Gentlemen, give me leave to be free with you ; and I desire you to consider the matter well.

“ Here you desire, and very reasonably, that *such* men may be sent over. But where shall we find them ? Where find men of that turn and capacity, in our own country, that will be willing to go ? You see that the *parochial clergy*, of whatever name or distinction, and of whatever note for their characters and abilities, are here settled already. Would you have them to go ? What would become of your own country ? You do not, I am sure, desire this, unless where any of them are free to offer themselves. And you well know, we ought not to compel any against their wills. — Is it your desire, that our *Dignatories* should go over ? You know that *they* also are fixed in their stations. And why should you desire to disturb them, unless their zeal for the Gospel should excite them to quit all the great posts and possessions which they enjoy here, and to run the hazard, by sea and land, of acquiring a far less support, attended with no honours, but with much laborious toil, in a foreign country ? You cannot  
in

in reason expect this at their hands; and if you did, you would certainly be disappointed.

“ Cast about therefore, for some other means of propagating the gospel in foreign parts. And what means or methods will be more likely to occur to you, on such an exigence, than that, when our own men, whether of greater or lesser note for their characters and abilities (but still of good note in both respects) are unwilling to embark in this honourable mission, the poor Americans and other pagans themselves, being duly instructed and qualified, and sincerely desirous to engage in the good work, should be commissioned, without coming over hither, to preach the gospel amongst their countrymen? whose various and different languages, they either better understand, or sooner and more readily attain, than most of those young men whom we commonly send over from these realms, for this purpose.”

I would then add, — “ You see, Gentlemen, from what I have said, that I do not in the least interfere with any wishes or expectations you can reasonably entertain, that, *some of the Clergy of greater note for their characters and abilities*, would engage in this work. I leave them to their liberty, and you to your success in applying to them. Prevail upon as many as you can, and with all my heart. For I believe, as you seem to do, that they might do the greater good. — Much less, you see, do I desire to hinder any worthy men, who are as yet unprovided with preferments or settlements here, from offering themselves, as volunteers, for this glorious mission. They are indeed the most likely persons to engage in it. And whereas you seem not much to approve of the characters or conduct (as neither indeed do any serious men) of some, perhaps many, of those who are so free to offer themselves, and are often too readily commissioned;

I must tell you, with the same freedom which I have hitherto used, that I intirely join with you, and would not have one of these men sent upon an errand for which they are not qualified, or, if I may venture to use the words of one of our Prelates, for which they have no *special call* of an higher and more noble nature, than what terminate in a mere livelihood, or, what is worse, in a scheme for filthy lucre; since such men would certainly disparage their mission, discredit those that sent them, dishonour the Gospel which they were deputed to propagate, and, in short, do infinitely more harm than good, not only in their respective cures, but far more extensively, and thereby the course of the Gospel would inevitably be obstructed, — *ridente Turcâ, plorante Pagano, nec dolente Judæo.*"

In this or a like manner, as I said, would I, as a friend to truth, and a contemner of all low artifices to evade its force, reason upon this subject, with honest, sensible, and fair-dealing men, who should appear to have truth only in view, and to have the real interest of mankind at heart. But political schemes and systems, founded on worldly interests, and keeping the Christian religion fast bound in their chains and confinements of it, do evidently stand in the way of the progress of the Gospel, and check all the fair hopes we might otherwise entertain of its success amongst the Indians.

Having now done with the few strictures I intended, upon the Bishop of St. David's interested observations upon the subject, I will here venture to go a step farther, and upon the same foot of freedom and philanthropy, to propose a few queries, which may deserve serious and compassionate attention.

Where



Where would be the harm or the inconvenience of appointing Bishops or Superintendants in our colonies abroad? — I easily foresee the objections, but think them not worth the attending to, as they are evidently political and selfish on the side of those who usually urge them.

But *ad hominem*. Bishops are of divine institution. — Why should there not be Bishops in our *American* plantations? The Bishop of *London* claims his right there. Might not my Lord of *London* appoint his suffragans there? If Bishops there are necessary, why are they not appointed? If not necessary there, why is the order so much insisted upon, as absolutely necessary here?

In two words, the Bishop of *London*, retaining still his right and prerogative, might, by commission, only authorized by law, nominate and constitute worthy Divines in *America*, to be his suffragan Bishops or Inspectors there. No need of all the farce and parade of their coming over hither for Consecration, and other such show and ceremony. All which, if necessary, may be done as well in *America* as in *England*.

As to the settlement of revenues, grandeur, and the like, I shall say nothing; though here alone lies the pinching argument, and all applications, though urged ever so modestly, and ever so forcibly, as they have often been, by rational and serious Divines of our church, will avail nothing, so long as this and the like objections, arising solely from interested views, are urged by the authority of great men, who have visibly a cause of their own to serve, whatever becomes of the cause of *Jesus Christ*.

If nevertheless our Governors would be pleased to consider a moment, there is a short and effectual way to preclude the avenues of avarice and ambi-

tion in such of our Clergy on this side the waters, as would otherwise be tempted to go over into our plantations abroad, in the manner that many of them do now into IRELAND (*k*), merely for the sake of wealth and honours.

Let the wealth, let the honours, and also the powers, of the proposed superintendents abroad, be moderate; agreeable to reason, agreeable to the frugality, agreeable to the honourable and honest occasions of a well-constituted state, and to the propagation of free trade, commerce, and purchases amongst the inhabitants. And, which is more perhaps than all the rest, and thoroughly conclusive with regard to the case in hand, may the definitive sentence and determination of our Governors in England be, That the natives of our plantations alone shall serve our spiritual cures there, yet still under proper regulations from England, and always subject to the general government of the Sovereign of Great Britain.

I shall only observe farther, that I can by no means be induced to believe, from the force of any arguments I have yet seen, or from the conduct of our ministry, past or present, that the civil Government, without whose interposition nothing can be done, judges a bench of Bishops of the same high authority and power, which our Bishops generally have here in England, to be really necessary towards the propagation of the Gospel in foreign parts. And it is most certain, from observation

(*k*) SWIFT speaks of a proposal made by some persons there, for removing the *only temptation* to this practice. But all trials of this kind will be ineffectual *now*, after so long a continuance and encouragement of such a practice in that kingdom. The pleading of *custom* alone, will be sufficient to support it, according to our present established maxims.—But nothing of this nature can as yet be pretended, in respect of our Indian provinces.

and

and experience there, considering different parties, and the tempers of many of the people, that such an order of superintendents, if established in our provinces abroad, would in effect, and as things now stand, rather obstruct than promote the spreading of the Gospel in foreign parts.

The insisting upon candidates for orders coming over from thence, so prodigious a way by sea, and exposed to so much danger of their lives (many of which have been often lost) only to be ordained here, seems really unaccountable (1).

Did our blessed Lord, or his Apostles, intend all this parade and ceremony for the propagation of his religion *to the uttermost parts of the earth*? And are they not, in good truth and seriousness, a very barefaced obstruction (let me forbear saying, for the present, a downright opposition) to it?

Men of reason and sense will consider, and will, I suppose, judge from what I have cursorily offered. And I could wish that some of them would press the matter farther in favour of our *American* settlements, and the advancement of true religion there, by the means of Missionaries of a truly evangelical character, though not of *high rank* in life.

What shrewd men, who know the world well, and attentively observe its views and measures, think of these matters, may easily be guessed from the following lines, which are in almost every one's hands.

When <i>Gospel preachers</i> fondly say,	}
We're bound our <i>great light</i> to display,	
And <i>Indian</i> darkness chase away ;	

(1) See some instances of this kind, and of the fatal effects of such a voyage, in the *Abstract* annexed to this Sermon, p. 56. and in many former *Abstracts*.

Yet none but drunken watchmen send,  
 Or scoundrel link-boys, for that end ;  
 When they cry up this holy war,  
 Which ev'ry Christian should be for,  
 Yet such as owe the *Law* their ears  
 We find employ'd as *engineers* :  
 This view my forward ear so shocks,  
 In vain they hold the *money-box*.  
 At *such* a conduct, which intends,  
 By *vicious means*, such *virtuous ends*,  
 I laugh off spleen, and keep my *pence*  
 From spoiling *Indian* innocence.

As are also, I suppose, the following of later date, which point, with equal satire and just indignation, at our unworthy treatment of the *Indians*, and the barefaced injury we do them.

Happy, thrice happy now the savage race,  
 Since *Europe* took their *Gold*, and gave them *Grace* !  
*Pastors* she sends to help them in their need ;  
 Some who can't write, with others who can't read.  
 And on sure grounds, the Gospel-pile to rear,  
 Sends *missionary* felons every year.  
 Our *vices*, with more zeal than holy *pray'rs*,  
 She teaches them, and, in return, takes *theirs*.  
*Faith* too she plants, for her own ends imprest,  
 To make them bear the worst, and hope the best.  
 And while she teaches on vile *interest's* plan,  
 As laws of God, the wild decrees of man,  
 Like *Pharisees*, of whom the scriptures tell,  
 She makes them ten times more the sons of hell.

CHURCHILL (*m*).

(*m*) Published long after the penning of the foregoing remarks; but inserted by the author.

If



If these things be true (and whether they are so or otherwise, may be easily known from authentic evidences upon the spot) it is time for the poor *Indians* to complain, for the rich *Europeans* to consider, and for all good men to remonstrate in the behalf of the former, and to condemn the latter.

POST

---

## POSTSCRIPT.

Non deficit alter  
*Aureus, et simili frondescit virga metallo.*

**I**N my reflections on the partial reasoning and interested views of the learned Prelate, whose arguments I had first undertaken to consider, I occasionally took notice of his misapplying scripture, in favour of his case. It happened, much about the same time, that I cast my eye upon the sermon of another Prelate of the same See; wherein I observed a misapplication, that was still more obvious, and more surprising.

I have, I must own, a high regard for the character of this last great personage; and it is with some reluctance, that I assume the liberty to remark upon a performance of so respectable a governor. But in a case of this kind, where the sacred text is concerned, and where the words of it are so manifestly (though, I hope, undesignedly) drawn away from their original meaning and design, and applied to a different purpose, and that by a Divine of such eminence in the Church, whose authority will go a great way with many, and whose example, in such an instance, may, by degrees, be attended with some ill effects, I must desire to be excused, if, laying claim to my right of free judgment, and independence on authority, I apply myself without ceremony to consider what this great man

2

hath

Humble Servant Richard Trevor.

hath advanced to the prejudice of that sacred text, and at the same time, I think, not much to his own credit.

The passage which I have in my view, is in a sermon delivered by his Lordship at the yearly meeting of the charity-schools in about London and Westminster, in the year 1747. The sermon was soon after printed, and dispersed, as usual, by a very reputable and charitable Society, throughout the kingdom. The exceptionable words in it (and most highly exceptionable indeed they appear to be) are these :

“ THE SON OF GOD HIMSELF  
 “ was forced negatively, to describe the glory of  
 “ the blessed, by saying, that *eye hath not seen, nor*  
 “ *ear heard, neither hath it entered into the heart of*  
 “ *man to conceive, that distinguished glory.*”

How shall I be able to reflect on them in a manner so tender as I could wish ? But extreme delicacy and strained complaisance are not my turn, nor agreeable to my principle.

I will here propose two queries.

1. Did my right reverend and learned author rightly consider the scope of this quotation ? This surely ought to have been done, in order to do justice to the sense of the sacred writer, and thereby, let me add, to his own sense too.

Read the words as they lie before you in the New Testament ; consider the design and the connection.

*Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him.* The words are in 1 Cor. ii. 9. though his Lordship (quoting them, I suppose, only by memory) doth not refer us, as his successor did since in his late sermon, to the place from whence he cites them.

They

They are a quotation of the Apostle from *Isaiah* lxiv. 4. which he applies or accommodates to the revelation of the Gospel; a discovery not made to former ages, nor possible to have been found out by man, in the utmost exercise of all his rational powers. This revelation (entirely a *mystery* before it was made known, especially in the great point of the conversion of the Gentiles, which is always and properly styled a *mystery* with regard to all preceding ages) was laid open only in the last and greatest dispensation, and was founded solely in the divine will, and the gracious and unmerited favour of God to his rational creatures.

This, I apprehend, with all our best expositors (*a*), is the whole and only scope of the Apostle in this passage. Nor doth he seem to have any particular view herein, to the glories of the heavenly state, much less to make it his only view; the current of his discourse and argument, running visibly upon the gospel-revelation in general, and the amazing and most glorious discoveries therein made to the children of men.

My good Lord, when he was drawing up his sermon, ought certainly to have adverted to the context of his citation. In one of the preceding verses, he finds the Gospel-dispensation termed a *mystery*, the *hidden wisdom* of God; and in that which immediately follows his quotation, it is observable, that this same *mystery* is asserted to be now *revealed*, namely those things which in former ages *eye had not seen*, &c. are now so fully seen, and in so clear a manner displayed to view, that *every eye* can see them, and every honest heart understand them. Which assertion can by no means be applied to the

(a) See *Locke*, *Whitby*, and others; and a judicious treatise written by Dr. *Burthogge*, intitled, *Christianity a revealed Mystery*.



glories of the blessed in a future state; another Apostle having expressly assured us, that those glories are not as yet revealed, and the particulars of them not known, (though the great design of the Gospel plainly is) all that we know or can know of them at present, being only this, That we shall see our blessed Lord as he is, and shall be like him. And I am humbly of opinion, that if his Lordship had cited this text of *St. John*, rather than that of *St. Paul* which he hath cited, it would have been more to his purpose, and less to his discredit.

I suppose I need not say more upon this argument, and therefore step on now to another query.

2. How comes this venerable Prelate so far to forget himself, as to assert in such strong terms, "That the SON OF GOD himself was even forced negatively to describe the distinguished glory of the blessed?"

I am really very sensibly touched with the thoughts of this assertion, made by so eminent an instructor of the public, and so openly in the face of so very large and respectable an audience, and also deliberately published to the world by his Lordship.

This, I own, is the first time I ever found it asserted, either in print or conversation, that *St. Paul* (a son of man) though a most eminent Apostle, was the SON OF GOD HIMSELF. And it was probably to the rest of the Christian world, as well as myself, until this time, a Mystery.

Whatever was the occasion of this hasty oversight, or want of proper precision and caution in delivering the word of God, it cannot be doubted but every good-natured man will readily forgive his Lordship this wrong step, whensoever he shall  
be

be pleased to make a free and open acknowledgment of his mistake, as open as the publication of his sermon was; a thing never yet done, that I know of, by his Lordship, though so many years have passed, since he preached and published it; but which nevertheless, most people think, he is in honour concerned to do, whenever he condescends to re-examine his discourse, and finds that his declaration is not maintainable, or whenever he is admonished of it, whether publicly or privately, and is convinced (as he cannot but be) that the thing was wrong. — Without such an acknowledgment, and also correction of the error, this sermon, it may be presumed, will descend but with an ill grace to future times; and cause perhaps some speculations, which it would be more easy, as well as more prudent, to prevent now, by an ingenuous retraction, than to suppress hereafter by wayward contention.

Several other observations I could make, but choose in decency and prudence to forbear, hoping that I have asserted nothing but what is strictly true, and well knowing that I intended no other: Great names and authority have no weight with me, nor do at all bias me in my inquiries after truth; and, reverencing the truths of the Gospel above all others, I exercise the moderate share of understanding, which it hath pleased God to give me, in examining all positions of theology by that test. — I shall only subjoin two or three remarks.

1. If these two sermons are sent into our plantations abroad, without correction, will not some people stare? And will men of sense and integrity; natives or foreigners, among the *Indians*, think very honourably of our great preachers here, or entertain a favourable opinion of our missions there?

Will

Will they not suspect our intentions, deride our missions, and conclude all to be farce for the sake of lucre? And when they find a man of God perverting the truth of God in our solemn assemblies, and afterwards publishing his declarations to the world with the sanction of his great name, authority, and station, can you think they will not wonder; some stand in doubt, some cavil, others disbelieve, and object to the admission of the Gospel itself?

These and the like things may deserve to be considered with all seriousness.

2. It may seem to be somewhat unaccountable, that these two worthy Prelates did not think fit to revise their sermons, and examine well their arguments, before they ventured to make them public. Being now exposed to public view, found to be in some instances wrong, in others very defective, and short of the true design of the Christian Gospel, nor the best calculated to promote that design, it is out of the power of their Lordships to rectify them any otherwise than by a free and generous acknowledgment, and also amendment of what may be unjustifiable in either.

3. It seems to be no less unaccountable, that the two honourable and worthy societies, before whom those sermons were respectively delivered, should, as it were in course, request those two reverend Prelates to commit those sermons to the press; and also that when the manuscript copies of the sermons were communicated by their Lordships to those societies, in order to be printed by them, none of their learned members or delegates, nor any other persons concerned, nor even the supervisors of the press (of licensers we have now no need) should have descried those errors, which are so visible  
and

and glaring, and, descrying them, have taken the liberty, in the most dutiful, respectful, and private manner, to have advertised their Lordships of them.

I have from my heart the most affectionate esteem for those two societies, being well assured of their honourable intentions, and sincere endeavours to communicate the Gospel to all their fellow-creatures. I hope they will pay some regard to these humble animadversions: which I close with my earnest prayers to God, for their good success in every thing that tends to the advancement of his Kingdom, in its genuine truth and holiness, among the sons of men.



---

A N  
A P P E A L  
T O T H E

Unprejudiced Judgment of Mankind,

IN BEHALF OF THE

I N D I A N S.

---

P A R T II.

Written in the Year 1764.

**H**AVING kept the foregoing papers a great while by me, without any intention of publishing them, after a certain event happened, which diverted my thoughts from the farther prosecution of my design; I have, upon some notices lately given me of a fresh dispute, now revived and carrying on upon the principal subject, looked over those papers again; and finding nothing in them that appears to me upon this review to be any way prejudicial to the public interest, or to the propagation of true Christianity, but quite the contrary in all respects, I am willing enough to consent to their publication, if the worthy person to whom I communicate them, and to whose judgment I sub-

C

mit

mit them, shall think them likely to be of any little service to the world, upon the present occasion. Otherwise I am content that they shall lie dormant still, as they have done for some years.

But before they pass out of my hands, I am desirous to add some farther reflexions upon the subject, and those particularly grounded upon certain notices of facts that may now at least excite the concern, as they unquestionably deserve the attention, of the public.

In a letter of the late Dean *Prideaux* to Archbishop *Tenison*, and in some other printed papers, relating to our plantations abroad, we have the following account.

1. “ The Gentiles in our East-India settlements  
 “ are an ingenious civilized people, who know  
 “ letters, and are well skilled in many arts, and  
 “ for the most part of good morals, which their  
 “ religion (the most refined piece of heathenism  
 “ ever yet in the world) most strongly obligeth  
 “ them to; and therefore they are thus far better  
 “ prepared to hearken to what reasons may be offered to them for Christianity, and the more easily  
 “ disposed to embrace it.

“ The *English* Gentiles are much more exact in  
 “ their morals, than either the *Portuguese* or *English*  
 “ Christians that live among them; and on  
 “ that account have a very bad opinion of Christianity.

“ All the *Dutch* factories and ships in the East-  
 “ India trade are provided with able ministers,  
 “ who are well encouraged; whereas the *English*  
 “ East-India Company are so negligent herein,  
 “ that they allow their people (who by the way  
 “ consist of several hundreds, and are all English)  
 “ no Minister: the consequence of which is, that  
 “ the people are degenerated to that degree of barbarity,

“barity, that they are reckoned the vilest and  
 “most wicked of any that our shipping meets with  
 “in their whole voyage to the Indies.”

Now, reflecting upon these particulars, I cannot but seriously lament the case of our poor heathens, and others in those remote parts, with respect to the small progress that the Christian religion is making among them, or is like to make (as far as we can see) till things are ordered better.

“The Gentiles in our East-India settlements (we are told) are, for the most part, of good morals; to which their [Pagan] religion most strongly obligeth them.”

“The English *Gentiles* also in the same settlements are, it is likewise said, much more exact in their morals than either the *Portuguese* or *English* Christians who live among them; and on that account have a very bad opinion of Christianity.”

What can we say to this? Is this bad opinion of Christianity owing to something bad in Christianity itself? It is not said, nor would have been true, if it had been said. The blame is directly laid to the Professors of it, and to those morals of theirs which are disagreeable to it, and contrary to its rules. Here then let me ask, With what face can we propose our doctrine (though ever so excellent in itself) to the Gentiles, when we so flagrantly contradict that doctrine by our morals? And why endeavour to convince them that our religion is pure, when our lives are vicious (a)? Their own

(a) “For this will be still an objection in the minds of those, who are strangers and enemies to our religion; *viz.* If the Gospel were so excellent an institution, as it is reported to be, surely we should see better effects of it, in the lives of those who profess it. When we would persuade a heathen to our religion, and tell him how holy a God we serve, what excellent patterns we imitate, what spiritual and divine precepts of

morals, we see, are said to be good, and even better than ours. Would we have them relinquish their better morals for our worse? Is this the design of the Christian religion? Has it no greater or better end in view than this, in the conversion of heathens? And is it worth our while to lay out any pains or expences, to make them Christians only in name, and not in heart and practice? — This only suggests to us, that (how much soever we may flatter ourselves to the contrary) we are not yet gotten into the right way of recommending the Christian religion to the world, of prevailing with the heathens to embrace it, and making them the better for it. Of which perhaps more hereafter. — To proceed.

“ All the Dutch factories and ships, in the East-India trade are provided with able ministers, who are well encouraged.” And is it not a shame to us, if we send over *unable* ministers? Do such (call them ministers, or what you will) deserve encouragement? Will the people pay them freely? Will they not see that they are a sett of men imposed upon them for hire, and that these creatures seek only for filthy lucre? How else shall we account for the conduct of many of them, when we so well know that some lie indolent there, and do little or nothing that is truly honourable for their

“ holiness and virtue our religion does contain, may he not reply, Would you have me to believe you, when I see you do not believe yourselves? If you believed your religion, you would live according to it. — The enemies of our religion, used to say in *Savio's* time, *Si Christus sancta docuisset, Christiani sancte vixissent*. If Christ had taught so holy a doctrine, Christians would have lived holier lives. — *Celsus* and *Porphyry*, *Hierocles* and *Julian*, among all their witty invectives against the Christian religion, have nothing against it, that reflects upon it so much, as the wicked lives of so many [who profess themselves] Christians.” *Tillotson's Sermons*, vol. I. serm. vii.  
pay?



pay? Others, having taken possession of their livings, settled curates therein, and letten out the profits (some, by the way, said to amount to several hundreds a year) return again into *England*, and live here in ease and opulence, performing no ecclesiastical duty, and yet receiving yearly their revenues from abroad, as if they were constant labourers upon the spot, and always carrying on the great cause of religion among the people of their charge.

You have seen the conduct of the *Dutch*; now for the *English*.

“The English East-India Company are so negligent about the concern of providing able Ministers, that they allow their people no minister at all.” And what is the consequence? Just what we would naturally expect in such a case, viz. “The people are degenerated to that degree of barbarity, that they are reckoned the vilest and most wicked of any that our shipping meets with in their whole voyage to the Indies.”

*Degenerated to barbarity — the vilest and the most wicked.* — This account, which was indubitable fact at that time (and the case, for aught I know, may not be much better now), is really shocking, and very grievous to reflect upon, and shews in the strongest colours the pernicious effects of having no ministers, or, which may be nearly as bad, none that are truly deserving of that name and character; — and most of all those who are a scandal to the profession.

Here another melancholy reflexion occurs, partly suggested by the former, though perhaps chiefly chargeable upon what is done in the *West Indies*. Our English planters, too intent upon gain (which however will do them no good in the end), have been often charged with inhumanity towards the

poor Indians, under their arbitrary government, using them like brutes, and detaining them still in slavery, for the greater augmentation of that gain. — Gentlemen, natives of *Britain*, a land of liberty, or (however) subjects of the English Government, which is ever propitious to liberty, and averse to oppression and tyranny, — how can you be so hard-hearted, so uncompassionate, so unjust to these unhappy wretches! — Do you consider, do you ever reason with yourselves upon the subject? Can you not reflect that the same God who made *you*, made *them*; and made them for liberty, as well as yourselves, and no less than yourselves; and also might have made them your Masters, and you their Slaves? The case being otherwise; you having them under your power, and they being unable to resist you; why will you extend that power beyond its proper limits, beyond reason, beyond humanity? — Away with this spirit of despotic pride and arbitrary government, and let it be heard of no more in Christian countries, in any countries where the voice of reason may be heard, where the affections of humanity may be felt. Lay your hands upon your hearts, examine your consciences, shew yourselves men. Do as you would be done by. Use your fellow-creatures as you ought to do. Treat them as being joint-partakers of human nature with yourselves. Give them their native liberty. How came they to lose it? Was it for their misdemeanours?

“ Were they e’en sold for crimes, ye polish’d,  
 “ say!

“ Ye, to whom learning opes her amplest page!

“ Ye, whom the knowledge of a living God

“ Should lead to virtue! Are YE free from crimes?

“ Ah! pity, then, these uninstructed swains;

“ And

- “ And still let pity soften the decrees  
 “ Of rigid justice, with her lenient hand.  
 “ Ye Planters, let *humanity* prevail : —  
 “ Curb your tyrannic sway ; knock off the chains  
 “ Of heart-debasing slavery : Give to MAN  
 “ Of ev’ry colour, and of ev’ry clime,  
 “ *Freedom*, which stamps him image of his God.  
 “ Then laws (oppression’s scourge, fair virtue’s  
 “ prop,  
 “ Offspring of Wisdom) should impartial reign,  
 “ To knit the whole in well-accorded strife.  
 “ Servants, not slaves ; of choice, and not compell’d,  
 “ The Blacks should cultivate your fertile soils.”

II. Towards rectifying the disorders above-mentioned, and facilitating the progress of the Gospel, more especially in our *Eastern* acquisitions, Dr. *Prideaux* makes the following proposals to the ruling powers, viz.

- “ That a seminary should be erected in our  
 “ *East-India* colonies, for educating proper persons  
 “ upon the spot, to supply our *East-India* mission,  
 “ and the churches set on foot in those parts, with  
 “ able and worthy ministers, under the govern-  
 “ ment of a Bishop, to be settled at *Madrafs*, or  
 “ some other place of the English settlements : And  
 “ that as soon as the Churches, Seminary, and Bi-  
 “ shop are settled, Ministers be bred up and or-  
 “ dained there upon the spot, in order to prevent  
 “ long vacancies, which will be the consequences  
 “ of sending for them to England ; where also  
 “ (the Dean goes on to observe) few will be found  
 “ willing to engage in it, but such as are of despe-  
 “ rate fortunes, or whose worth is not such, as to  
 “ put them in hopes of getting any preferment at  
 “ home ; who, for the most part, do more hurt  
 “ than good in the places whither they are sent ; as



“ is sufficiently experienced as well in the West-  
 “ Indies as in the East.”

Now, although these proposals were made so long ago as the year 1694, or soon after, we do not find that any great regard has been paid to them, or that any earnest endeavours have been used to render them effectual in their chief design, from that time to this: nor have the several remonstrances that have been made since upon the subject, by several hands, ever been solidly answered, or the grievances complained of removed.

That wise and thoughtful man, the Dean of *Norwich*, well knew the importance of every article he proposed, and the absolute need there was, as things then stood, and I suppose do still, of the several provisions which he requested might be made. — A *Seminary* for the education of youth upon the spot, to prepare them more immediately for the ministry. — *Able* and *worthy* Ministers to supply the churches. — And a *Bishop* to superintend over those Ministers and Churches, and to regulate every thing in the best manner, for the honour and advancement of the Christian religion among the Indians.

What hindered these laudable proposals from taking effect? It would be well if we could truly say, that worldly views and interests were not the chief obstacles then, and have been so ever since.

The other things that the worthy Dean takes notice of, and seriously laments, as every good Christian should do, are these.

1. The very bad consequences of *long vacancies* in our several cures abroad, when, for want of immediate succession and supply, the poor people are left in a dangerous state, having no instruction, and being every day liable to be perverted, either to Popery or Enthusiasm, or even to fall back in-

to



to a total irreligion and dissoluteness of lives and manners; things to be dreaded, and also timely provided against, by all wise states and governments. — And is there no remedy? Not, it seems, upon the present footing, or as the affair of missions is hitherto ordered. Application must be made to *England*. From hence alone must those vacant cures (ordinarily, if not always) be provided for. And what a long space of time will this intermediate negotiation take up? Perhaps, in the mean time, many thousands of souls are lost. I ask again, Is there no remedy? and take leave to add, where is our compassion? If a remedy there be, let us apply it. If compassion in our hearts, let us shew it. 'Tis no time to neglect or delay. The occasion is important, the demand urgent. Will a point of mere ceremony, a little worldly interest, a fondness for pre-eminence, and an unwillingness to part with any species or grain of authority, countervail the loss of our religion, and its necessary consequence, the loss of souls? — All wise men will consider and judge.

2. The difficulty of getting *proper* supplies from England, although such supplies could be sent over in due time. “ Few will be found willing to engage in such an undertaking, but such as are of *desperate* fortunes, or whose worth is not such, as to put them in hopes of getting preferment at home.” — This seems to be the case still: and is it not a lamentable one? Is it not a reproach to our country, and even to our Christianity? — Men of *desperate* fortunes; men whose morals, worth, and character is small or none, and their sense of religion, perhaps, as little; and, lastly, men who have no other hopes of getting preferment, but what they can get abroad, where their conduct and character are not known, till they unhappily and most  
fatally

fatally display them to their shame, to the shame of their country, to the disgrace of their ministry, and to the creating an aversion to them and it. — From whence the next observation inevitably follows, viz.

3. That such men do more *hurt* than *good* in the places to which they are sent from *England*. If they do more hurt than good, as the Dean assures us is *sufficiently experienced* in both the Indies (and this very intelligent person well knew the truth of what he asserted) why are such men sent over at all? Would it not be far better to detain them at home? Are these fit instructors for the *Gentiles in our East-India settlements*? who are confessed to be an *ingenious civilized people, and, for the most part, of good morals*; to the practice of which their very *Pagan* religion (but the most refined system of this kind, we are told, that ever existed) most strongly obligeth them. Being so ingenious, so civilized, and so moral in their lives, will they not despise, reject, and ridicule, a set of alien instructors, who are neither ingenious, civilized, nor moral in their behaviour? And pray let me be permitted to ask, whether these poor but very commendable people are really *brought nearer to the kingdom of God*, by the means of such instructors? Better leave them, I should think, to the wisdom and goodness of God, *whose tender mercies are over all his works*, than intrude upon them such preachers, and commit the care of their souls to those who have no care of their own. But, if authority think otherwise, I have no more to say; having this satisfaction however, that I have said nothing but what, I hope, will be found to be agreeable to reason, and what, I am very sure, I draw from an authority in these things, as great and good as any.

I have

I have presumed to ask, whether it can be reasonably supposed, that the more virtuous Gentiles last mentioned are really brought over by the means we now use (unless we use more effectual means than those which were applied formerly) to a better state, with regard to the present world at least, than they are in already; or, which is more still, are indeed by those means brought *nearer*, in the evangelical sense of that expression, *to the kingdom of God*? so as to enable us to affirm, with just assurance, that we sincerely believe the great end of the Gospel is in some good measure attained among them, by our preaching to them?

Instead of taking upon me to determine any thing myself in so nice a point, I rather choose to propose to your consideration the following words of the wise and judicious Archbishop *Tillotson*, which appear to me to demand serious attention.

“ Many are apt to pity the poor heathens, who  
 “ never heard of the name of Christ, and sadly to  
 “ condole their case. But, as our Saviour said on  
 “ another occasion, *Weep not for them, weep for your-*  
 “ *selves.* — Dost thou lament the condition of  
 “ *Socrates*, and *Cato*, and *Aristides*, and doubt what  
 “ shall become of them at the day of judgment?  
 “ and canst Thou, who art an impious and pro-  
 “ phane Christian, think that thou shalt escape the  
 “ damnation of hell? Dost thou believe that the  
 “ moral heathen shall be cast out? and canst Thou,  
 “ who hast led a wicked life under the profession  
 “ of Christianity, have the impudence to hope,  
 “ that Thou shalt sit down with *Abraham*, *Isaac*,  
 “ and *Jacob* in the kingdom of God? No: —  
 “ Better had it been thou hadst never known one  
 “ syllable of the Gospel, never heard of the name  
 “ of Christ, than that, having taken it upon thee,  
 “ thou shouldst not depart from iniquity. Happy  
 “ had



“ had it been for thee, that thou hadst been born  
 “ a *Jew*, or a *Turk*, or a poor *Indian*, rather than  
 “ that being bred among Christians, and professing  
 “ thyself of that number, thou shouldst lead a vi-  
 “ cious and unholy life (*b*).”

As I am from my soul desirous of the propaga-  
 tion of the Gospel amongst the heathens, I wish,  
 I earnestly wish, that this holy and divine religion  
 may be propagated amongst them in its original  
 simplicity and purity, as it is laid down for us in  
 the New Testament. As there set forth, every  
 discerning eye can see it, and every honest heart  
 (not prepossessed with other principles) will embrace  
 it, and be thankful for it. I mean, and would be  
 understood to mean only, and to recommend to the  
 world, *Catholic Christianity*, plain and simple, intel-  
 ligible and rational, truly scriptural, devoid of all  
 scholastical niceties, systematical formalities, and  
 all party-notions, pretences, and prejudices.

If this be our design in endeavouring to propa-  
 gate the Christian religion among the Indians, we  
 shall succeed; otherwise, let me speak freely, we  
 never shall.

There are many infidel books and pamphlets  
 dispersed of late years with the utmost assiduity,  
 zeal, and expence, and that by our own people,  
 amongst the Indians, to oppose and disparage the  
 Christian religion, and hinder the progress of it  
 amongst them. Nor are the Romish emissaries less  
 zealous and assiduous to sow their own tares, when-  
 ever they have opportunity, and can by their cunning  
 artifices contrive it, to gain the same ends. And the  
 endeavours of these latter operate as effectually and  
 as fatally to that purpose, as those of the former.

Now here both these parties suggest to us a lesson  
 of great importance. Should not we also, in our

(*b*) Sermon above cited.

turn,



turn, be equally zealous, and equally laborious, to teach the way of truth to the poor heathens, when we see the way of error is so industriously taught them by those who are enemies to truth?

But then here is a great obstacle, which will always stand in our way. We do not seem to propose teaching them Christianity at large, as we ourselves are taught it in the Gospel, but the tenets of our particular churches, and divided interests. Which is, perhaps, a fault imputable, more or less, to Protestants of all communions, in their endeavours, however well designed, to propagate the religion of Christ, amongst the Gentile nations. But this course, as I intimated before, will never do. When we preach to heathens, we should preach to them nothing but what we find dictated to us in the revelation of God. We cannot alter, we cannot mend, his religion. Any addition we make to it, whether in matter of form or doctrine, will do it hurt, and obstruct its progress. The Gospel sets forth to us a most amiable religion, and most useful in the world; every way agreeable to reason, and the divine attributes, and most exactly suited, in every branch of it, to the necessities of mankind. Teach this religion to the Gentiles, teach them this religion in its genuine purity, impress it with earnestness upon the minds of men, and let the light of your good example, at the same time, shine before them; you then do your work effectually, and God will prosper you. If you teach the tenets of men, instead of the doctrines and commandments of God, you destroy his work, and will have it to answer for hereafter, at his great tribunal.

I can only speak my mind; and I have spoken it with sincerity, and with the most cordial affection to the Christian cause. And what can I say more? I shall only propose a few queries, though upon  
points

points which may prove offensive to many, and wherein I cannot well expect a favourable hearing. However, whether men will hear, or whether they will forbear, I will utter my sentiments with freedom, begging to be excused, if I utter any thing not consonant to reason, or not agreeable to the design of the Gospel of Christ. — I address myself to Protestants in general, and more particularly to the governors and other members of the church of England.

I. Since your design, you say, is, and I believe it to be, to propagate the Gospel among heathen nations, can you really think it to be the best method to this purpose, and the most likely to do any real good, to propose any sett of particular tenets and opinions to your ministers, oblige them to subscribe what you propose, and enjoin them to teach your peculiarities to the world? Are you sure that all your assertions are right? not only agreeable to the letter and sound, but to the genuine sense and spirit, of the Gospel, and promotive of its great design, the salvation of the world? If otherwise, look *you* to it. To all reasonable, considerate, and candid men, as far as ever I could yet learn, it appears to be an ill-judged practice to tie men down to any human propositions, to oblige them to declare their assent to any dictates of authority, in matters of mere opinion. We have but *one* Dictator and Master in divine things, even Christ. We are all brethren, united under him. Learn of him, of him only, and of the holy Apostles whom he hath sent. As to all peculiarities of your own, all notions and opinions which you or your forefathers have presumed to tack to his Gospel, better drop them at once, and have no more to do with them, especially when you propose to convert the heathen world to the faith and obedience which he hath left in charge  
with

with his church, and which he hath appointed as the only test of true Christianity. If you teach those converts any other Christianity than that, you injure them, and disparage your religion. They have a right to the truth at your hands, to the genuine truth of Jesus Christ, as he left it in his Gospel, and as the Apostles left it in their writings. They have a right to pure unmixed Christianity from you, if you teach them any Christianity at all. And therefore all additions to his original revelation, all mixtures of the word of men with the word of God, all impositions upon men's understandings and consciences, all encroachments upon the right of private judgment, and all restraint of modest and free enquiry, ought by all means to be laid aside by those, who would teach a new religion to the Gentiles, and make it evident to those Gentiles, that it is the old, the genuine religion of the New Testament; a religion every way agreeable to unprejudiced reason, and, on all accounts, deserving their attention and cordial reception, with a conformable practice. Otherwise their reason will recoil, being stunned with difficulties, and perplexed with niceties; and our unbelievers of the Christian name among them will be sure to seize the handle given them, and will neglect no means to disparage and defeat the whole design of our European missions, calculated to plant Christianity among the unconverted nations.

I have no objection to the drawing out the great lines of the Gospel-dispensation, in proper order, for the use and direction of our Gospel-missionaries, preaching to the Gentiles, provided the delineation be exhibited in the very words of that Gospel, and contain all the grand points which our Lord taught, and his Apostles promulgated to the *heathen* world, when they were sent out by him to convert them

to



to his religion, and to make them heirs of the common salvation through him. They generally began with the existence of God, and his attributes; they reasoned clearly and strongly on these heads, and then gradually and wisely descended, by evident connexions, to the doctrine of salvation by Jesus Christ. — There cannot be a more effectual method than this in preaching to the Gentiles; and Gospel-ministers should be directed to no other method, nor have any other doctrines enjoined them to deliver, as from God, or his Christ, to those Gentiles.

2. In translating our *Bible* for the instruction of the heathens in Christianity, do we take the wisest course, when we translate the *whole* indiscriminately, and put into their hands at once all the dark passages of the Old Testament, all the Levitical laws (which are of no manner of use to mankind, but rather of disservice, upon the whole, to weak people, who cannot make a proper distinction), and all the obscure prophecies therein, for many pages running, which are confessedly above the understanding of the vulgar, even in Christian countries, and will probably be more so in those of the Heathen; whose occasions and circumstances evidently require plain instruction, the plainest that we can give them, from the life and doctrine of our Saviour chiefly, and from the declarations of his own immediate Missionaries; which ours also should teach, and of which they should give the poor people a salutary example, and lively evidence, by the conformity of their own conversation and practice to what they teach them.

Should we not therefore, in translating the sacred writings for the use and edification of our ignorant fellow-creatures, begin gently, and proceed gradually, by communicating to them, first, the plainest



plainest things only, and the most necessary for them to know and practise in order to their salvation? — The rest might follow afterwards, in due course of time and improvement, if those other things should be then judged to be evidently necessary, and truly useful. — If I am mistaken in my judgment herein, I readily ask, and hope to obtain pardon from my superiors (*c*).

(*c*) There is no occasion to ask pardon for proposing so evident, and indeed so universal, a rule of instruction, as that of *The plainest things first*. But, I must own, this worthy author's arguments have not convinced me of the expedience of a partial translation of the Bible, at *any* period of instruction. In the latter part of the paragraph, it seems to be made a question, whether *those other things* would *ever* be evidently necessary, &c. If not, it follows of course that they *never* should be translated. But would not this subject us to *one* reproach of Popery? Does not *that* talk of *obscurity*, of the weakness of the people, &c. as reasons for withholding the scriptures from them? And as we are not satisfied with such reasons from them, should we build any thing upon those reasons ourselves? It would be to little purpose to say, that they withhold the *whole*, and we only *part*. They are our rivals in these missions; and if you translate the plainest books or passages *faithfully*, an artful Popish Priest might form difficulties upon it, which would puzzle a more enlightened mind than that of an Indian, and thereupon form his argument against permitting *any part* to be translated. We are told, there are among the Indians, "unbelievers of the Christian name:" suppose any real offence might arise to an Indian from a translation of the Levitical law; would an European infidel, who desired to disgust him with Christianity, suffer him to be ignorant of *that*, or any other dark or offensive scripture, even though it should not be translated into the Indian tongue? Would not he give him the meaning of it from an English Bible? And what would an Indian think of his Christian instructors, should he come to know by *any means*, that there were some parts of their religious Code with which they did not think him fit to be trusted? And what should we ourselves think in the like circumstances? But there is another consideration of *equal*, perhaps of *greater weight* still. You could not go far in instructing an Indian *faithfully* even in the *plainest* scriptures of the N. T. without his discovering that there were in them perpetual references to a *former* dispensation. What would you do to instruct him in the *Connection*,

3. With regard to *forms of public worship* to be used in our American churches, I must be free to ask, Is there any necessity in the nature of things, considered either in a religious or moral view, — Is there even a political necessity — that those forms should be in all respects the same with the forms which we use in our churches in England? — For my part, I declare seriously, I can discern no just reason for this, but much to the contrary; and am of opinion, that here also, as in the foregoing case, it will be best to make a proper *discrimination* of materials. Those might be selected to great advantage, partly out of the *Bible*, and partly out of our *Common-prayer Book*; both which have in them the best stores of this kind. But to impose our Liturgy upon these nations, in its present form (I mean, with all its imperfections, all its exceptionable passages, all its accumulations, repetitions, want of order, and other improprieties, and without due correction and improvement) would seem to be too great a stretch of Authority, and also, on some accounts, impolitic, and not likely to be attended with the best success at the long-run, nor to prevent objections, and help to reconcile differ-

if the passages in the O. T. referred to in the vth, vith, and viith chapters of St. *Matthew*, some of them out of the Levitical Law, were still untranslated? Could you, without such translation, shew him *properly* the comparative purity of the one dispensation above the other? Let us then not be afraid of an *indiscriminate* translation for the use of the Indians. 'Tis using them *fairly* and *honestly* at least. Let us act the honest part, and leave consequences to God's good Providence. No presumptive foresight of *inexperience* will justify our acting *partially* in the great affair of religion. Every Indian with the whole Bible before him, translated in his own language, must, at the first, be in the case of the *Ethiopian Eunuch*, *Acts* viii. He must have *some man to guide him*. Provide him a *Philip*, an able, judicious, and disinterested instructor, and leave the rest to him who *giveth the increase*. EDITOR'S REMARK.

ences.

ences. One would have thought, that our long experience of the unhappy contentions that have subsisted among the subjects of these three kingdoms, upon the account of our present Liturgy, might have suggested to us a caution against imposing that identical book, unreformed, upon our Fellow-Christians in other countries, which hath been the occasion of so much difference and opposition in our own. If after all the applications that have been made from time to time, for a revival of our Liturgy, nothing has yet been done, nor is like, that we can see, to be done soon, to make that Liturgy less offensive, and more generally acceptable and useful, may we not hope, nevertheless, with respect to our colonies abroad, that things of this kind, being managed by discreet hands, and in due time and manner, may be done with more ease and success there, than they can be here? where the chains and fetters, invented by our forefathers, fastened upon us by their decrees, and made still faster and closer by ourselves, who hug them, cannot perhaps be shaken off in haste; and it may now be doubted whether they ever can or will to the world's end. Such is the pass to which we find ourselves brought at last, by means of long custom, imposition, and inveterate prejudice, and because our foundations were not made large enough at first.

But now here is an opportunity offered us to go upon a larger and firmer footing, in the several dominions which we have acquired abroad, if we will but apply our attention with seriousness to this purpose, and open the doors of our Church wide enough to receive all good Christians (desirous to unite with us) into its communion, by softening, retrenching, or totally dropping all our rigid in-



junctions, and whatever may give just offence to reasonable and candid men; and by making our Liturgy, in all its parts, to be truly regular, compact, catholic, and christian.

Men of worth and discernment, who live upon the spot in those countries, and observe well the turn and temper of the inhabitants, and their various needs in religious matters, may seem to be the most competent judges of what may be most for their benefit, in concerns of this kind; I mean, more especially (in the present case) with regard to the settling a liturgy, or liturgies, or proper corrections of our own, among them (*d*). And such persons, being pious and learned, as well as judicious and prudent, and men of temper, may also be supposed to be best qualified to draw up such forms for the use of Christian Congregations in those parts, who prefer precomposed to unwritten addresses to God. And, by the way, why might not other Christians, assembling for divine worship, have their solemn devotions written, though not printed? Those who still should choose to adhere to their present method of prayer, without book or notes, might well be tolerated there, as they are in *England* and *Ireland*. And this would be found best in the end, for all communities of Protestants, all living in dutiful obedience to the civil government under which they are respectively placed, and maintaining brotherly love and peace, as well as free trade and commerce, with each other.

In regard to the liturgical forms before mentioned, the compilers would need no other direction or injunction from our government, than to

(*c*) See the Charter of the College of New York in America, relating to a collection of prayers out of our Liturgy, for the use of the said College.



whatever confusion may be occasioned by them to the state, or however obstructive they may prove of public peace.

Mr. or my Lord A. B. (for he may be either by his style) is evidently of this complexion. He is outrageously angry at the *Bostonites* for their clamours and excesses about the stamp duties, and does all he can to instigate the legislature to take vengeance upon them; which shews, by the way, what manner of spirit he is of, and with what *meekness* and *moderation* he would deal out his ecclesiastical censures, should it fall to his share to exercise the episcopal function among them.

The acts of violence indeed, committed on this occasion, are wholly inexcuseable; and there can be little doubt but that the obnoxious offenders will be properly punished by the colonists themselves.

In the mean time, the more sober part of the colonists think they have material objections to the stamp-duties, as an incumbrance upon their commerce and private property, which they are not well able to bear. — If these objections are well grounded, we may be sure a British senate will give them due consideration. And whether they are well or ill-grounded, A. B. knows no more than another man.

He asks, “But what, after all, has episcopacy to do with the stamp-duty?” — Not nothing, if episcopacy and the stamp-duty are both in the list of what they call their grievances; not to mention that episcopal instruments are not likely to lessen the stamp-duty, either with respect to the number of stamps used, or the value of them.

But, if some people, who should know, are not mistaken, they have something more to do with each other.

Mention has been made above of a plan transmitted to *England* from *Boston*, no long time ago, for the propagation of the Gospel among the bordering *Indians*; which plan was to be carried into execution by the colonists themselves, and at their own expence. The misfortune was, that the undertakers were *anti-episcopalians*; and the event was, that a negative was returned to their application. The colonists knew well enough, that *lay-politicians* could have no objection to a benevolent scheme of that kind; nor had they been used to have denials to reasonable proposals in times past. But, when it came to be known that the project of episcopizing these colonies was then on the carpet, and warmly pursued, it was natural for them to conclude, by whose means the scheme was disappointed; as the success of it might probably have shewn, what little need there was of a prelacy to propagate the Gospel in the colonies, and likewise might have eclipsed the lustre which bishops propose to derive upon their order, by appropriating that department to themselves and their own missionaries.

Hence is said to have arisen the *first* of their *late* discontents, which, being improved by a matter that more immediately affected their property, broke out in the manner related in our printed accounts from thence. Which may serve as a full and sufficient answer to A. B.'s question, What has episcopacy to do with the stamp-duty?

An angry man should never undertake the patronage of a doubtful cause. His arguments, generally speaking, end in honour and victory to his opponents. And such, if I mistake not, is the unhappy situation of the indignant A. B.

The paragraph in the public papers, importing,  
 “ that the ancestors of the North-American colo-  
 “ nists fled to the wilds of *America* to get rid of  
 “ Episco-

"Episcopacy," A. B. would flatly contradict, if he durst. He goes, however, as far towards it as he can, by imputing their migration to some odious views of their own; which, however, he ventures only to advance in the way of a problem. He is more confident, and advances it as a *notorious* fact, that "an equal number of our colonies were peopled by *episcopalians*, who were forced by *Cromwell* to leave their native home, for expressing too great a veneration for episcopacy, and to avoid the tyranny of their Independent Lords, who would not suffer the free exercise of their religion."

A. B.'s cause would have suffered nothing by his bringing some credible testimony in support of this *notorious* fact. I have seen many histories of those times, but never had the luck to meet with this anecdote in any of them; and, if it is really extant, I should be greatly indisposed to believe it, both as it runs counter to *Cromwell's* known politics with respect to toleration, as likewise to the accounts we have of his great care and vigilance over the colonies, where these episcopalian refugees would not have been more secure than they were in *England*, if it had been *Cromwell's* inclination to molest them.

But let us allow that this is a piece of true history, what will A. B. get by it? He dare not affirm, with all his assurance, that these episcopalians were the *first* settlers in any of those colonies to which he pretends they fled. What then is the consequence? Is it not that they found a comfortable and generous *Asylum* among those who were of a *different persuasion*? This appears from this gentleman's own account of the flourishing condition of the *episcopalian* colonists at this day, which could never have been the case, if their ancestors had been disturbed or incommoded by the original *presbyter-  
vian*

*rian* or *congregational* colonists; or rather if they had not been countenanced and assisted by them in their civil and commercial interests, as well as allowed to worship God after their own mode.

In the mean time, it is a clear case, that the posterity of these *original* settlers have no better opinion of episcopacy than their forefathers had, who planted them there. What then must be thought of the *gratitude* of these modern episcopalians, who are endeavouring to subject the posterity of those who harboured and protected their forefathers, to the galling Yoke of Episcopacy? Will not such an event serve for an exemplification of the fable of the Countryman and the half-starved Serpent?

I call episcopacy a *galling yoke*, in the present case, upon the credit of A. B. himself. For they who *glory in their episcopal persuasion*, and particularly because of *an uninterrupted succession*, must glory in it upon true, genuine, *papistical principles*; and must assert all those episcopal powers to the present order, which the old *jure divino* prelates of the *Stuartine* times claimed and exercised, and which drove the old anti-episcopalians into the wilds of *America*, and would as certainly drive the present generation of them to the wilds of *Lapland*, or *Siberia*, if Mr. A. B. should be invested with the episcopal powers, and backed by the civil authority necessary for effecting this kind of *reformation*.

In an evil hour does he mention the Bishop of *London's* commissaries as precedents *a fortiori* for the admission of Bishops into our colonies. Some of the exploits of these commissaries have been touched upon above, and the world will, perhaps in no long time, be entertained with a complete collection of their *acts* and *monuments*; when the expediency of sending bishops into our plantations, with



with each a rod of iron, of double and treble the weight of that in the hands of a commissary, may perhaps appear, with respect to its *civil* as well as *religious* utility.

A. B. confidently affirms, that the church of *England* is *established* in most of our colonies. I will not enter into dispute with him upon this head, as perhaps it might only give him occasion to quibble on the word *established*. Dr. *Mayhew*, though he does not determine the point for himself, hath stated the whole case so, that a man of more modesty and judgment than this letter-writer would hardly venture upon the affirmative with no better support than a brazen front. I will therefore only ask Mr. A. B. a few plain questions.

If the episcopal church of *England* is by law *established* in any part of *North America*, what should hinder our episcopal-propagating society from sending bishops into that part, without any farther leave or license from the *civil* powers? What should restrain my Lords the Bishops of *England* from consecrating such bishops for this express purpose, and dispatching them to their several departments, with credentials merely *ecclesiastical*? What occasion to apply to the administration, or even to the legislature, for new powers or appointments to carry a measure into execution, which is already *authorized* and *established* by law? Can the church of *England* be said to be *established*, where bishops are *not established*? There cannot be a deficiency in the funds requisite to maintain *one* such bishop at least. A. B. hath mentioned a pretty handsome benefaction of Archbishop *Tennison*, appropriated to the future support of the *first See* that should be erected in those parts; and he is very sanguine in his expectations, that "many hundreds in this opulent kingdom would embrace the opportunity of  
" shewing

“ shewing their veneration for the church of *Eng-land*,” by contributing (I suppose he means) to the charge of episcopizing the colonies. Upon whom then does it depend to afford or withhold this *opportunity*, which is already supposed to have the sanction of the law of the land?

With respect to what this splenetic man says of the great desire of so many of our colonists to have bishops among them, the case appears to be this. Where liberty is allowed for different forms of religious worship, and men are left to entertain and enjoy their own opinions and prejudices, there parties in religion are unavoidable, *there must be* HERESIES, taking the word in the most innocent sense; and it would be miraculous if our colonies were without them. The world, in its present state, will never be sufficiently enlightened to see the great felicity, or to understand the righteousness and equity, of an universal Christian toleration; there must of consequence be party-feuds of the religious kind in our colonies, as well as in other places. Among these parties, there are men of the *episcopal* persuasion. *Episcopacy* has many adjuncts of pomp and power, and shew and ceremony, which are extremely taking with weak superstitious minds, and extremely useful to others for *political* purposes. In the eyes of the vulgar, it has great advantages over Christianity in a plainer and more primitive dress. The simplicity of our protestant dissenting sects is not (as *Charles II.* said, shrewdly enough) *religion for gentlemen*. They who are under the power of this prepossession, and have been taught to value the *forms*, equally with the *essentials* of Christianity, think it a very hard case that the *episcopal* church should barely be upon a level with one of the *presbyterian* or *congregational* sort; or of some others of still more freedom from forms.

The

The true interest of our colonies, as civil and commercial communities, is a small matter with men full of these ideas, in comparison of the dignity of the church of *England*, and the honour of being a member of it. And even with wiser men, who care little for churches of any denomination, as churches, the foresight of an advancement in their station, some improvement of their fortunes, or some advantage in trade, under the wing of an established bishop, will bring them into the episcopizing project, with as much zeal and contention as the bigots of a sincerer complexion.

All this is of course fomented by the *propagating* spirit of the *episcopal* missionaries, who, though sent thither for a very different purpose, in the estimation of our common people at home, know well enough how to earn their wages of their masters *one* way ; if they cannot, or choose not to do it in *another*.

One of these we have now before us in the Person of A. B. who, as plainly appears by his own representation, has been in our colonies upon this episcopal duty, and retails to us with all freedom, not only his own sentiments of *episcopacy*, but of others whom he hath had under his tutorage, and shews his inclination to have episcopacy established in our *colonies*, upon principles which have long since been contemptible and ridiculous, even in the estimation of all sensible protestant episcopalians at home ; principles which would make our present colonists as miserable as their forefathers were, when they sought their peace and liberty and refuge in the wilds of *America*.

But, whatever this narrow-hearted zealot may pretend, there are others, who know the religious state of our colonies as well as he, who assure us, that the most sensible and judicious even of our  
episcopalian



episcopalian colonists, would be very sorry to see bishops sent to and settled among them; and that for very obvious reasons. And one thing, as it happens, I know myself from the best authority; and that is, that when the project of sending bishops to *America* was taken up in bishop *Gibson's* time, the most considerable of the *London* merchants trading to those parts expressed their disapprobation of that measure, for reasons which will never lose their force, while the British constitution and commerce are upon their present basis; and to which every wise administration will, we hope, pay a proper attention for all time to come.

There is one argument often repeated in this controversy, and which has made no small figure on the episcopal side of it; with an answer to which I shall conclude these remarks.

It is the risque that missionaries run by passing and repassing to and from our colonies on account of ordination by an established bishop. "To remedy this *grievance*," saith A. B. "many proposals have been made to the government, and happy would it have been for the church and state, had they been duly attended to."

And, with respect to *some* of these proposals, so say I too. One of the proposals has been, that the chartered society for the propagation of the Gospel in foreign parts should, as was intended, without respect of persons, pension missionaries for propagating the Gospel among the savage tribes of *America*, of the *presbyterian*, or *congregational*, as well as of the *episcopal* persuasion; and have an eye rather to the *morals*, *abilities*, and *christian temper* of the *men*, than to the *nicety* of their ordination. And as to that part of the argument which relates to officiating in episcopal congregations, let us look to our beginnings. There is a statute of 13 *Eliz.* which



which permits ministers, ordained in the *presbyterian* or *other* form, not prescribed in King *Edward's* Ordination-book, to officiate in the church of *England*, and even to hold church-livings, provided they are qualified in a manner, where the *presence* of a bishop is not at all necessary: for subscriptions to the thirty-nine articles, and other matters there mentioned, may be, and are to this day, taken by commission from the bishop to inferior clergymen.

If this will not content our episcopalian colonists, the risque must be run; nor is it a greater risque than must be undergone by those civil officers commissioned by his Majesty in several colony-departments, who make no such complaints, and who never had, that I could hear of, any charm to keep them from being shipwrecked or drowned more than the clergy. And if it is necessary our colonists should have a *bishop* of their own, in order to prevent these accidents in *the one case*, what expedient must be found out to prevent them in *the other*? But, provided A. B. and his fellow-episcopalians can but carry their own point, they never look farther, nor consider whither their arguments on the behalf of the church would carry them, either with respect to the prosperity of the colonies, or the true ends and benefits of their connexion with the mother-country.

T H E E N D.

which private ministers, and in the  
times of other, the great and the small  
Orthodox book, no other in the church of  
law, but even to this church, provided  
they are placed in a manner, which the  
of a bishop is not at all new; for the  
to the church, and other matters, and  
mentioned, now we, and many other, have  
concerned, and the church, and the  
it will not contain any other matter, and  
the things must be, and it is a great  
then must be, and it is a great  
influence of the church, and the  
ments, and it is a great  
never had, but I could hear of, and it is a great  
them from being, and it is a great  
than the church, and it is a great  
should have a word of, and it is a great  
went the church, and it is a great  
must be found out, and it is a great  
that, provided A. B. and the church, and it is a great  
can be found out, and it is a great  
rather, and it is a great  
the church, and it is a great  
with respect to the church, and it is a great  
your ends, and it is a great



